arXiv:1701.03780v1 [math.CO] 13 Jan 2017

Generalised Majority Colourings of Digraphs

António Girão* Teeradej Kittipassorn† Kamil Popielarz‡

January 16, 2017

Abstract

The purpose of this note is to draw attention to problems related to a concept called majority colouring recently studied by Kreutzer, Oum, Seymour, van der Zypen and Wood. They raised a problem of determining, for a natural number k, the smallest number $m = m(k)$ such that every digraph can be coloured with m colours where each vertex has the same colour as at most $1/k$ proportion of its out-neighbours. We show that $m(k) \in \{2k-1, 2k\}$. We also prove a result supporting the conjecture that $m(2) = 3$. Moreover, we prove similar results for a more general concept called majority choosability.

For a natural number $k \geq 2$, a $\frac{1}{k}$-*majority colouring* of a digraph is a colouring of the vertices such that each vertex receives the same colour as at most $1/k$ proportion of its out-neighbours. We say that a digraph D is $\frac{1}{k}$-*majority m-colourable* if there exists a $\frac{1}{k}$-majority colouring of D using m colours. The following natural question was recently raised by Kreutzer, Oum, Seymour, van der Zypen and Wood [4].

Question 1. *Given $k \geq 2$, determine the smallest number $m = m(k)$ such that every digraph is $\frac{1}{k}$-majority m-colourable.*

In particular, they asked whether $m(k) = O(k)$. Let us first observe that $m(k) \geq 2k-1$. Consider a tournament on $2k-1$ vertices where every vertex has out-degree $k-1$. Any $\frac{1}{k}$-majority colouring of this tournament must be a proper vertex-colouring, and hence it needs at least $2k-1$ colours. Conversely, we observe that $m(k) \leq 2k$.

Theorem 2. *Every digraph is $\frac{1}{k}$-majority $2k$-colourable for all $k \geq 2$.*

This is an immediate consequence of a result of Keith Ball (see [3]) about partitions of matrices. We shall use a slightly more general version proved by Alon [1].

Lemma 3. *Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $n \times n$ real matrix where $a_{ii} = 0$ for all i, $a_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, and $\sum_j a_{ij} \leq 1$ for all i. Then, for every t and every positive reals $c_1, \ldots, c_t$ whose sum is 1, there is a partition of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ into pairwise disjoint sets $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_t$, such that for every r, $1 \leq r \leq t$ and every $i \in S_r$, $\sum_{j \in S_r} a_{ij} \leq 2c_r$.*

* Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WB, UK; A.Girao@dpmms.cam.ac.uk.

† Departamento de Matemática, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rua Marquês de São Vicente 225, Gávea, Rio de Janeiro, RJ 22451-900, Brazil; ping41@mat.puc-rio.br.

‡ Department of Mathematics, University Of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152, USA; kamil.popielarz@gmail.com

Proof of Theorem 2. Let D be a digraph on n vertices with vertex set $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$. Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $n \times n$ matrix where $a_{ij} = \frac{1}{d^+(v_i)}$ if there is a directed edge from v_i to v_j and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. We apply Lemma 3 with $t = 2k$ and $c_i = \frac{1}{2k}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2k$ obtaining a partition of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ into sets $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_{2k}$, such that for every r, $1 \leq r \leq 2k$ and every $i \in S_r$, $\sum_{j \in S_r} a_{ij} \leq \frac{1}{k}$. Equivalently, the number of out-neighbours of v_i that have the same colour as v_i is at most $\frac{d^+(v_i)}{k}$ where the colouring of D is defined by the partition $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \cdots \cup S_{2k}$. □

Question 1 has now been reduced to whether $m(k)$ is $2k-1$ or $2k$.

Question 4. *Is every digraph $\frac{1}{k}$-majority $(2k-1)$-colourable?*

Surprisingly, this is open even for $k = 2$. Kreutzer, Oum, Seymour, van der Zypen and Wood [4] gave an elegant argument showing that every digraph is $\frac{1}{2}$-majority 4-colourable and they conjectured that $m(2) = 3$.

Conjecture 5. *Every digraph is $\frac{1}{2}$-majority 3-colourable.*

We provide an evidence for this conjecture by proving that tournaments are *almost* $\frac{1}{2}$-majority 3-colourable.

Theorem 6. *Every tournament can be 3-coloured in such a way that all but at most 204* vertices receive the same colour as at most half of their out-neighbours.*

Proof. The proof relies on an observation that in a tournament T, the set $S_i = \{x \in V(T) : 2^{i-1} \leq d^+(x) < 2^i\}$ has size at most 2^{i+1}. We proceed by randomly assigning one of three colours to each vertex independently with probability 1/3. Given a vertex x, let B_x be the number of out-neighbours of x which receive the same colour as x. We say that x is *bad* if $B_x > 1/2 \cdot d^+(x)$. Trivially $\mathbb{E}(B_x) = 1/3 \cdot d^+(x)$, and hence by a Chernoff-type bound, it follows that, for $x \in S_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(x \text{ is bad}) &= \mathbb{P}(B_x > 1/2 \cdot d^+(x)) = \mathbb{P}\left(B_x > (1+1/2)\mathbb{E}(B(x))\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{(1/2)^2}{3}\mathbb{E}(B_x)\right) = \exp(-d^+(x)/36) \leq \exp(-2^{i-1}/36).\end{aligned}$$

Notice that when $i \geq 10$ then $\mathbb{P}(\text{x is bad}) \leq 2^{-(2i-7)}$. Let X denote the total number of bad vertices. Since the vertices of out-degree 0 cannot be bad, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{9} 2^{i+1}\exp(-2^{i-1}/36) + \sum_{i \geq 10} 2^{i+1}2^{-(2i-7)} \\ &\leq 204 + \sum_{i \leq 10} 2^{-i+8} < 205.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, there is a 3-colouring such that all but at most 204 vertices receive the same colour as at most half of their out-neighbours. □

*We remark that using a linear optimization programming, we are able to reduce the number of *bad* vertices from 204 to 7.

Observe also that the argument can be modified to prove a special case of Conjecture 5.

Theorem 7. *Every tournament with minimum out-degree at least* $2^{9\dagger}$ *is* $\frac{1}{2}$*-majority* 3*-colourable.*

Let us now change direction to a more general concept of majority choosability. A digraph is $\frac{1}{k}$*-majority* m*-choosable* if for any assignment of lists of m colours to the vertices, there exists a $\frac{1}{k}$-majority colouring where each vertex gets a colour from its list. In particular, a $\frac{1}{k}$-majority m-choosable digraph is $\frac{1}{k}$-majority m-colourable. Kreutzer, Oum, Seymour, van der Zypen and Wood [4] asked whether there exists a finite number m such that every digraph is $\frac{1}{2}$-majority m-choosable. Anholcer, Bosek and Grytczuk [2] showed that the statement holds with $m = 4$. We generalise their result as follows.

Theorem 8. *Every digraph is* $\frac{1}{k}$*-majority* $2k$*-choosable for all* $k \geq 2$*.*

We were informed by David Wood that Theorem 8 was independently proved by Fiachra Knox. We prove Theorem 8 using a slight modification of Lemma 3.

Lemma 9. *Let* $A = (a_{ij})$ *be an* $n \times n$ *real matrix where* $a_{ii} = 0$ *for all* i*,* $a_{ij} \geq 0$ *for all* $i \neq j$*, and* $\sum_j a_{ij} \leq 1$ *for all* i*. Then, for every* m *and subsets* $L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_n \subset \mathbb{N}$ *of size* m*, there is a function* $f : \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ *such that, for every* i*,* $f(i) \in L_i$ *and* $\sum_{j \in f^{-1}(r)} a_{ij} \leq \frac{2}{m}$ *where* $r = f(i)$*.*

Proof. By increasing some of the numbers a_{ij}, if needed, we may assume that $\sum_j a_{ij} = 1$ for all i. We may also assume, by an obvious continuity argument, that $a_{ij} > 0$ for all $i \neq j$. Thus, by the Perron-Frobenius Theorem, 1 is the largest eigenvalue of A with right eigenvector $(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ and left eigenvector $(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n)$ in which all entries are positive. It follows that $\sum_i u_i a_{ij} = u_j$. Define $b_{ij} = u_i a_{ij}$, then $\sum_i b_{ij} = u_j$ and $\sum_j b_{ij} = u_i \left(\sum_j a_{ij}\right) = u_i$.

Let $f : \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a function such that $f(i) \in L_i$ which minimises the sum $\sum_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i,j \in f^{-1}(r)} b_{ij}$. By minimality, the value of the sum will not decrease if we change $f(i)$ from r to l where $l \in L_i$. Therefore, for any $i \in f^{-1}(r)$ and $l \in L_i$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in f^{-1}(r)} (b_{ij} + b_{ji}) \leq \sum_{j \in f^{-1}(l)} (b_{ij} + b_{ji}).$$

Summing over all $l \in L_i$, we conclude that

$$m \sum_{j \in f^{-1}(r)} (b_{ij} + b_{ji}) \leq \sum_{j \in f^{-1}(L_i)} (b_{ij} + b_{ji}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} (b_{ij} + b_{ji}) = 2u_i.$$

Hence, $\sum_{j \in f^{-1}(r)} u_i a_{ij} = \sum_{j \in f^{-1}(r)} b_{ij} \leq \sum_{j \in f^{-1}(r)} (b_{ij} + b_{ji}) \leq \frac{2u_i}{m}$. Dividing by u_i, the desired result follows. □

Proof of Theorem 8. The proof is the same as that of Theorem 2, using Lemma 9 instead of Lemma 3. □

[†]As before, the same linear optimization program can reduce 2^9 to 50

In fact, the same statement also holds when the size of the lists is odd.

Corollary 10. *Every digraph is $\frac{2}{m}$-majority m-choosable for all $m \geq 2$.*

This statement generalises a result of Anholcer, Bosek and Grytczuk [2] where they prove the case $m = 3$ which says that, given a digraph with colour lists of size three assigned to the vertices, there is a colouring from these lists such that each vertex has the same colour as at most two thirds of its out-neighbours.

We have established that the $\frac{1}{k}$-majority choosability number is either $2k - 1$ or $2k$. Let us end this note with an analogue of Question 4.

Question 11. *Is every digraph $\frac{1}{k}$-majority $(2k - 1)$-choosable?*

References

[1] N. Alon, *Splitting digraphs*, Combin. Probab. Comput., 15 (2006), pp. 933–937.

[2] M. Anholcer, B. Bosek, and J. Grytczuk, *Majority choosability of digraphs*, arXiv:1608.06912, (2016).

[3] J. Bourgain and L. Tzafriri, *Restricted invertibility of matrices and applications*, in Analysis at Urbana, Vol. II (Urbana, IL, 1986–1987), vol. 138 of London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 61–107.

[4] S. Kreutzer, S. Oum, P. Seymour, D. van der Zypen, and D. R. Wood, *Majority Colourings of Digraphs*, arXiv:1608.03040, (2016).